



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,959	11/21/2003	Paul J. Flanningan	59010US002	3577
32692	7590	07/25/2005	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			PATEL, NIHIR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,959

Applicant(s)

FLANNINGAN ET AL.

Examiner

Nihir Patel

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 11th, 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04.27.2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3743

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleason et al. (US 6,016,804) in view of Fecteau et al. (US 6,497,232).

Referring to claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 and 23, Gleason discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing a fluid communication component that is separately from the supporting portion of the face-piece insert. Fecteau discloses a respirator headpiece and release mechanism that does provide a fluid communication component that is separately from the supporting portion of the face-piece insert (**see figure 2**). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Gleason's invention by providing a fluid communication component that is separately from the supporting portion of the face-piece insert as taught by Fecteau in order to make it easier to replace the part and to reduce the manufacturing cost.

Referring to claims 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 20, close reading of the applicant's specification reveals that these components have always been close tolerance or critical elements therefore applicant's designation of critical element does not carry any patentable weight. It should be noted that applicant's specification alludes to separate manufacturing of critical

Art Unit: 3743

elements and non-critical elements (**prior to assembly**) emphasis added as the novel aspect of the applicant's invention.

Referring to claim 21, Gleason discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of using the fusing process to assemble the supporting portion to the fluid communication component. Fecteau discloses a respirator headpiece and release mechanism that states that any process may be used to assemble the supporting portion to the fluid communication component (**see column 4 lines 1-10**). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Gleason's invention by using the fusing process to assemble the supporting portion to the fluid communication component as taught by Fecteau in order to prevent the user from breathing in bad air.

Referring to claims 8 and 21, a close reading of the applicant's specification (**page 7 lines 15-25**) reveals that the applicant has not established any criticality on why the supporting portion and the fluid communication component must be fused together and therefore it would be obvious to one in the ordinary skill of the art to use the fusing process or any other process as stated by Feteasu to assemble the two component.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleason et al. (US 6,016,804) in view of Freund (US 5,592,937).

Referring to claim 8, Gleason discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing a fluid communication component that is made from similar polymeric materials. Freund discloses a respirator mask with stiffening elements that does provide a fluid communication component that is made from similar polymeric materials. Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Gleason's invention by providing a fluid communication

Art Unit: 3743

component that is made from similar polymeric materials as taught by Freund in order to properly fit the user's face.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Nihir Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4803. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the examiner supervisor Henry Bennett can be reached at (571) 272 4791.

NP
July 14th, 2005



Henry Bennett
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700